

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/034,528	ELDRIDGE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Russell M. Kobert	2829	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Russell M. Kobert. (3) Scott Hauser.
 (2) N. Kenneth Burraston. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 November 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 43.

Identification of prior art discussed: Littlebury (5012187).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representatives, Mr. Burraston and Mr. Hauser, have come forth with evidence that the product as claimed is produced in a manner that results in a different product than that of Littlebury. The merits of the claimed invention according to claim 43 were discussed to determine if evidence, now presented, provide additional weight to the invention as claimed. Applicants assert that the "movable element" in the process according to claim 43 provides adequate evidence by the degree of movement permitted therein to permit more close alignment of the probe elements to the planarity of contact terminals thereby producing smaller gouge marks on the electrical contact terminals of the semiconductor device. However, it was noted by the Examiner that although "gauge" marks may be produced on the final product, nothing noted in the claim describes the final product having gauge marks. Moreover, the claim does not show how such gauge marks are produced and how a distribution of these gauge marks on the product, "a tested semiconductor device," are distributed in any combination of uniformity, size, depth and position to make the final product novel over the prior art.